REMARKS

In the Final Office Action, Claims 1-26 are pending, were examined and stand rejected. In this Response, Claims 1, 7, 15 and 21 are amended, no claims are cancelled and no claims are added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of pending Claims 1-26 in view of the following remarks.

I. Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1 and 2 are provisionally rejected under the obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 16 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/781,512 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,158,018 to Bernasconi et al. ("Bernasconi"). Applicants hold in abeyance this rejection until such time as the claims on which the rejection is premised are granted.

II. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-19 and 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bernasconi". Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Regarding Claim 1, Claim 1 is amended to recite the following claim feature, which is neither disclosed, taught nor suggested by Bernasconi:

> a control logic coupled to the trigger-matching logic to select a set of instructions upon detection of at least one matched trigger condition and to execute operations as specified by the selected set of instructions to modify the captured incoming read/write request cycle prior to transmission to a downstream destination device, wherein the set of instructions is selected based on the at least one matched trigger condition and the upstream device is different from the downstream destination device. (Emphasis added.)

According to the Examiner, Bernasconi discloses the capture of an incoming cycle at col. 9, line 54, where according to the Examiner, Bernasconi teaches the current DSP program address corresponds to the Applicant incoming cycle. (*See*, pg. 8, ¶1 of the Office Action mailed January 29, 2007.) The passage alluded to by the Examiner refers to three phases of operations of integrated circuit 12, for example, as shown in FIG. 1 of Bernasconi.

Regarding the operation of device 12, the various components of device 12, as shown in FIG. 1, are described by Bernasconi as follows:

> Bus 24 provides the current DSP program address from the embedded DSP (hereafter more simply referred to as "DSP") to the patching circuitry 22, the ROM 18, and the RAM 20. Additionally, DSP program software stored in the ROM 18 is provided via bus 26, the patching circuitry 22, and bus 30 to the DSP 16. Similarly, corrected DSP program software stored in the RAM 20 such as section 20b of the RAM 20 is provided via bus 28, the patching circuitry 22, and bus 30 to the DSP 16. (col. 6, lines 15-23.) (Emphasis added.)

As indicated by the cited passage above, reference numeral "24" of FIG. 1 refers to a bus, which as taught by Bernasconi, provides the current DSP program address from the embedded DSP 16 to the patching circuitry 22, the ROM 18 and the RAM 20. (*See*, supra.) As further disclosed by Bernasconi, the DSP program address is compared against a break address to identify flawed DSP program software. (*See*, col. 9, lines 53-57.)

Applicants respectfully submit that the use current DSP program address provided by bus 24 from DSP 16 to patching circuitry 22, ROM 18 and RAM 20, as taught by Bernasconi, to identify flawed DP program software neither teaches nor suggests the capture of an incoming read/write request cycle received by an I/O controller nor the modification of such read/write request cycle prior to transmission to a downstream destination device, wherein the upstream device is different from the downstream destination device, as recited by amended Claim 1.

Hence, the Examiner has incorrectly equated the DSP program address, which is provided by bus 24 to patching circuitry 22, ROM 18 and RAM 20, with the incoming read/write request cycle referred by amended Claim 1. However, to further illustrate the features of amended Claim 1, amended Claim 1 recites the capture of an incoming read/write request cycle from an upstream device, as well as the modification of such captured incoming read/write request prior to transmission to a downstream destination device, wherein the upstream device is different from the downstream destination device as recited by amended Claim 1.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's amendment to Claim 1 prohibits the Examiner from illustrating that the single prior art reference disclosure of Bernasconi either expressly or inherently includes the presence of each and every element recited by amended Claim 1, as required to establish prima facie anticipation.

For each of the reasons provided above, therefore, Claim 1 and all claims that depend from Claim 1 are patentable over Bernasconi, as well as the references of record. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §102(b) rejection of amended Claims 1-6.

Regarding Claims 7 and 21, Claims 7 and 21 are amended to recite the following claim features, which are neither disclosed, taught nor suggested by Bernasconi or the references of record:

> capturing an incoming read/write request cycle from an upstream device;
> . . .
> executing the selected generated instructions sequentially to modify the captured incoming read/write request cycle prior to transmission to a downstream destination device wherein the upstream device is different from the downstream destination device. (Emphasis added.)

Applicant respectfully submits that the above-recited features of amended Claim 7 and 21 are analogous to the previously-described features of amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant's arguments provided above with regard to the §102(b) rejection of Claim 1 as unpatentable over Bernasconi equally apply to the Examiner's §102(b) rejection of Claims 7 and 21 as anticipated by Bernasconi.

As indicated above, the Examiner is prohibited from relying on Bernasconi as an anticipatory reference, since Bernasconi fails to exactly disclose an invention for the modification of a captured incoming read/write request cycle prior to transmission to a downstream destination device, wherein an upstream device, is different from the downstream destination device as recited by amended Claims 7 and 21. Richardson, supra.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's amendment to Claims 7 and 21 prohibit the Examiner from establishing a *prima facie* case of anticipation, since the single prior art reference disclosure of Bernasconi fails to either expressly or inherently include the presence of each and every element recited by amended Claims 7 and 11. Verdegaal Bros, supra.

Therefore, for at least the reasons provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 7 and 11, as amended, as well as all claims that depend on claims 7 and 11, are patentable over Bernasconi, as well as the references of record. Consequently, Applicant respectfully

requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §102(b) rejection of Claims 7-14 and 21-26.

Regarding Claim 15, Claim 15 is amended to recite the following claim feature, which is neither disclosed, taught nor suggested by Bernasconi or the references of record:

> an instruction execution unit to execute the set of instructions selected by the instruction select unit to modify the captured incoming read/write request cycle prior to transmission to a downstream destination device and the upstream device is different from the downstream destination device. (Emphasis added.)

Applicant respectfully submits that the above-described feature of amended Claim 15 is analogous to the previously-recited feature of at least amended Claim 1. Consequently, Applicant's arguments provided above with regard to the §102(b) rejection of Claim 1 as anticipated by Bernasconi equally apply to the Examiner's §102(b) rejection of Claim 15, as anticipated by Bernasconi.

Therefore, for at least the reasons provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 15, as amended, as well as claims that depend from claim 15 are patentable over Bernasconi, as well as the references of record. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §102(b) rejection of Claims 15-20.

Dependendent Claims

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of each claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending (1) are in proper form, (2) are neither obvious nor anticipated by the relied upon art of record, and (3) are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 4/23/07

By: _____
Joseph Lutz, Reg. No. 43,765

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF FASCIMILLE TRANSMISSION:
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile on the date below, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Melissa Stead 4-23-07
Melissa Stead